

In the Honble High Court of Chhattishgarh at Bilaspur (C.G.)

W.P.(s). No. 743/ 2007

(8)

Petitioner

- (1) Ku. Rambha Sahu, Aged 49 Years,
D/o Bharat Lal Sahu,
Assistant Teacher,
Govt. Primary School, Shankri,
Distt Durg (CG)
- (2) Smt. Pournima Chandrakar, Aged 39 Years,
W/o Shri Narendra Kumar Chandrakar,
Assistant Teacher
Govt. Primery School, Borsi.
District Durg, C.G.
- (3) Mahendra Kumar Sahu, Aged 43 Years,
S/o Late Shri Lakhan Lal Sahu
Assistant Teacher,
Govt. Middle School, Kasari
Post Dhangaon
Rajnanadgaon (C.G.)
- (4) Dwarika Prasad Sahu, Aged 41 Years
S/o Shri Lajja Ram Sahu
Assistant Teacher
Govt. Middle School, Dummar-Dehikala,
Tahsil & District Rajnandgaon (C. G.)

P.R. No. 891/07
Presented by SK Varmar
1/2/07

RECEIVED-COPY
1-2-07
CLERK to A. O. BILASPUR

VersusRespondent

- (1) State Govt. of Chhattisgarh
Through:- Secretary,
Education & Tribal
Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur
(C.G.)
- (2) The District Education Officer,
Durg. (C.G.)
- (3) The District Education Officer
Rajnandgaon (C. G.)



Writ petition under articles 226 of the Constitution of India
for issuance of writ in the nature of MANDAMUS.

The petitioner, Above named, furnishes the particulars of the writ
petition as under :-

31

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (S) No. 743 of 2007

Petitioners : Ku. Rambha Sahu and others
Versus
Respondents : State Government of Chhattisgarh
and others

W. P. (S) No. 744 of 2007

Petitioner : Satya Narayan Dewangan
Versus
Respondents : State Government of Chhattisgarh
and others

And

W. P. (S) No. 745 of 2007

Petitioner : Harish Chandra Orsa
Versus
Respondents : State Government of Chhattisgarh
and others

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Satish K. Agnihotri, J

Mr. Ajay Shrivastava, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mrs. Anju Ahuja, Dy. Govt. Advocate for the respondents/State.

ORDER

(Passed on 8th day of February, 2007)

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as learned Deputy Government Advocate appearing for the respondents/State jointly submit that the facts of the present case is similar to that of in W. P. (s) 5976 of 2006 (Sushil Tiwari & others Vs. State Govt. of Chhattisgarh & others), which was allowed vide order dated 7th November, 2006. They further submit that the question of law involved is also the same.
2. In view of the above stated submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the writ petitions are allowed in terms of the order dated 7th November, 2006 passed by this Court in W. P. (s) 5976 of 2006. No order as to costs.
3. A copy of this order be placed on record in connected writ petitions.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge